UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,871	11/21/2003	Richard M. Edwards	306117	3053

7590 10/30/2007

Mark R. Kendrick
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
Suite 2800
725 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, ALLEN H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,871	EDWARDS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allen H. Nguyen	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9,13,14,17-22,25 and 28-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *7,8,10-12,15,16,23,24,26,27 and 31-34* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9,13,14,17-22,25 and 28-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 7-8, 10-12, 15-16, 23-24, 26-27, 31-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 09/25/2007.

2. Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction in the reply filed on 09/25/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no serious burden on the examiner for examining all species. This is not found persuasive because 1) it requires different search query for different invention. 2) The prior art used for rejecting the elected species cannot be used to reject the non-elected species. The examiner requires further search to determine whether there are other prior art directed to the non-elected species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434).

Regarding claim 1, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses a method of determining final media selection parameters (i.e., the combination of print job selections corresponds with the combination of printer properties available at the selected printer; see Abstract, fig. 8), comprising:

receiving a print job including a print client indicator (i.e., a combination of print job selections are programmed by the user at a UI 16 and inserted into the parameter block 82; see col. 7, lines 26-28, figs. 2, 12A);

comparing the print client indicator to a plurality of entries in a mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; see col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11);

determining if a matching entry including the print client indicator exists in the mapping module (fig. 8, 66-N);

determining if the matching entry includes media selection parameters (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N);

outputting at least one of the media selection parameters as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; see col. 7, lines

31-32, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 4, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the method, wherein the print client indicator is a modality indicator (i.e., each of the finishing option rules can be represented by a "TRUE" state or a "FALSE" state; see col. 8, lines 20-21, fig. 13).

Regarding claim 5, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the method, wherein the print client indicator is a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; see col. 4, lines 13-15, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 6, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the method, wherein the text attribute is one of a queue name (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; see col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 9, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses a program code storage device (37, fig. 2), comprising:

a machine-readable storage medium (storage in a memory section of the combination examiner 37, col. 7, line 15);

machine-readable program code, stored on the machine-readable storage medium, having instructions, which when executed cause a multi-media printer (i.e., the media description parameters are represented by nodes and each node is coded

appropriately for storage in a memory section of the combination examiner 37; see col. 7, lines 13-16, fig. 2) to:

receive a print job including a print client indicator (i.e., a combination of print job selections are programmed by the user at a UI 16 and inserted into the parameter block 82; see col. 7, lines 26-28, figs. 2, 12A);

compare the print client indicator to a plurality of entries in a mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; see col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11);

determine if a matching entry including the print client indicator exists in the mapping module (fig. 8, 66-N);

determine if the matching entry includes media selection parameters (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N);

output one of the media selection parameters as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; see col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 13, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the program code storage device (37, fig. 2), wherein the print client indicator is a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; see col. 4, lines 13-15, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 14, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the program code storage device (37, fig. 2), wherein the text attribute is one of a queue (i.e., a combination of printing selections is programmed on the user interface and transmitted to a selected one of the print queues; see col. 2, lines 22-25, fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Meade, II (US 7,251,047).

Regarding claim 2, Hower, Jr. '434 does not disclose the method, wherein the print client indicator is a network identity.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Meade. In particular, Meade teaches the method, wherein the print client indicator is a network identity (i.e., a virtual media tray may be defined to represent any number of combinations of physical print trays, network locations, locations outside of the network, and/or other operations or print parameters, which may be conditional; see col. 5, lines 22-27).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Meade, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Meade to include: the method, wherein the print client indicator is a network identity, since Meade stated in col. 2, lines 3-6 that such a modification would ensure network printers may also be configured to manage virtual media trays that define combinations of physical paper trays and other operations.

Regarding claim 3, Hower, Jr. '434 does not disclose the method, wherein the print client indicator is a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) port number.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Meade. In particular, Meade teaches the method, wherein the print client indicator is a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) port number (i.e., a combination of a physical print media tray that holds standard legal size paper and a network location (such as an IP address) associated with a document management system; see col. 5, lines 37-40).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower and then given the well-established teaching of Meade, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower as taught by Meade to include: the method, wherein the print client indicator is a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) port number, since Meade stated in col. 2, lines 13-18 that such a modification would ensure in some instances the operations may cause the printer to

pull information (e.g., headers, footers, watermarks, IP addresses, email addresses, fax numbers, web pages, public encryption keys, accounting billing codes, etc.) from the network to be used in processing a document so that is can be encrypted, stored, and/or transmitted.

7. Claims 17-18, 25, 28, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147).

Regarding claim 17, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses a multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2) to render an image from a submitted print job, comprising:

a decoding module (Print Queues 42-N, fig. 2) to receive the submitted print job ("decision trees" through use of a suitable pyramid coding technique, col. 6, line 50, figs. 6A-6B) and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job (i.e., the media description parameters are combined in the printer profile to facilitate parsing of the printer profile into one or more decision trees; see col. 6, lines 51-53);

a mapping module (Printer Profile 44-N, fig. 2) including a plurality of entries (the organization of parameters into one or more decision trees, col. 6, lines 66-67), each of the plurality of entries including at least one print client indicator and a corresponding media selection parameter (i.e., the parameters for any given printer profile could be organized into any sort of link list(s) having a suitable hierarchical structure; see col. 7, lines 1-2);

a parameter determination module (43, fig. 2) to receive the at least one print

client indicator from the decoding module (fig. 8, 66-N), to compare the at least one print client indicator to the plurality of entries in the mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; see col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11) to determine if a matching entry corresponds to the at least one print client indicator (Yes, Send job to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N), and to output at least one media selection parameter as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry is found in the mapping table (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; see col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Hower, Jr. '434 does not disclose a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; see col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower, Jr. '434 and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly '147, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower, Jr. '434 as taught by Reilly '147 to include: a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job, since Reilly '147 stated in col. 1, lines 43-45 that such

a modification would ensure a printer is a peripheral device that can be shared on a network connected to a print server.

Regarding claim 18, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2), wherein the mapping module is stored on a mass storage device (i.e., a combination of printer properties provided in the stored printer profile; see col. 4, lines 54-55).

Hower, Jr. '434 does not disclose the mass storage device with the mapping module is internal to the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches the printer server of Hower, Jr. '434 could be internal to the multi-media printer (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; see col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower, Jr. '434 and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly '147, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower, Jr. '434 as taught by Reilly '147 to include: the mass storage device with the mapping module is internal to the multi-media printer, since Reilly '147 stated in col. 1, lines 43-45 that such a modification would ensure a printer is a peripheral device that can be shared on a network connected to a print server.

Regarding claim 25, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the multi-media printer, wherein the print client indicator is a modality indicator (i.e., each of the finishing option rules can be represented by a "TRUE" state or a "FALSE" state; see col. 8, lines 20-21, fig. 13).

Regarding claim 28, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses a multi-media printer (Printer 12-N, fig. 2) to render an image from a submitted print job, comprising:

a decoding module (Print Queues 42-N, fig. 2) to receive the submitted print job ("decision trees" through use of a suitable pyramid coding technique, col. 6, line 50, figs. 6A-6B) and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job (i.e., the media description parameters are combined in the printer profile to facilitate parsing of the printer profile into one or more decision trees; see col. 6, lines 51-53);

a mapping module (Printer Profile 44-N, fig. 2) including a plurality of entries (the organization of parameters into one or more decision trees, col. 6, lines 66-67), each of the plurality of entries including at least one print client indicator and a corresponding job settings file (i.e., the parameters for any given printer profile could be organized into any sort of link list(s) having a suitable hierarchical structure; see col. 7, lines 1-2),

a parameter determination module (43, fig. 2) to receive the at least one print client indicator from the decoding module (fig. 8, 66-N), to compare the at least one print client indicator to the plurality of entries in the mapping module (i.e., a comparison of these parameters with the decision tree 76 indicates that a permissible combination of print job selections has been programmed; see col. 7, lines 28-30, fig. 11) to determine if a matching entry corresponds to the at least one print client indicator (Yes, Send job

to Print Queue, fig. 8, 72-N), to determine if the job settings file in the matching entry includes at least one media selection parameter, to determine if the at least one media selection parameter is defined and operational (fig. 8, 66-N), and to output the at least one media selection parameter as one of the final media selection parameters if the job settings file in the matching entry is found in the mapping module (i.e., the corresponding job ticket 35 is transmitted to one of the print queues 42; see col. 7, lines 31-32, fig. 2).

Hower, Jr. '434 does not disclose a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Reilly '147. In particular, Reilly '147 teaches a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons; see col. 2, lines 42-45).

In view of the above, having the system of Hower, Jr. '434 and then given the well-established teaching of Reilly '147, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Hower, Jr. '434 as taught by Reilly '147 to include: a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job, since Reilly '147 stated in col. 1, lines 43-45 that such a modification would ensure a printer is a peripheral device that can be shared on a network connected to a print server.

Regarding claim 30, Hower, Jr. '434 discloses the multi-media printer, wherein the print client indicator is one of a modality indicator (i.e., each of the finishing option rules can be represented by a "TRUE" state or a "FALSE" state; see col. 8, lines 20-21, fig. 13), and a text attribute (i.e., the client/server job ticket 35 may assume an ASCII format; see col. 4, lines 13-15, fig. 3).

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Leone, III et al. (US 2003/0002081).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Leone '081. In particular, Leone '081 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device (i.e., a data template stored in the printing apparatus provides a structure for specifying the printed format of the data transmitted from the portable memory device; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 and then given the well-established teaching of Leone '081, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 as taught by Leone

'081 to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is stored on a removable memory device, since Leone '081 stated on page 1, paragraph [0001] that such a modification would ensure a printing apparatus adapted to accept data transferred from a portable memory device, to format the data according to operator instructions, and to generate a personalized print item that utilizes the transferred data.

9. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Yoneda et al. (US 6,564,337).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via am operation panel of the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Yoneda '337. In particular, Yoneda '337 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via am operation panel of the multi-media printer (i.e., the operation panel control program 21 of printer 20 updates the IP address that is stored in port setting information 22(S61); see col. 5, lines 47-49, figs. 1, 6).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 and then given the well-established teaching of Yoneda '337, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 as taught by Yoneda

'337 to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated via am operation panel of the multi-media printer, since Yoneda '337 stated in col. 1, lines 7-13 that such a modification would ensure a method of controlling communication between a plurality of devices such as personal computers or printers connected to a network, and, in particular, relates to a method of communication control in a network wherein communication is possible under a plurality of protocols.

Regarding claim 21, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Yoneda '337. In particular, Yoneda '337 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer (i.e., when the UDP communication control program 13 of personal computer 10 receives the response message from printer 20 (S74), it compares the IP address corresponding to the MAC address of printer 20 that is set in the IP/MAC correspondence table of communication destination information 12 with the IP address contained in the response message and, if these are different, updates this to the IP address contained in the response message (S75); see col. 7, lines 40-50, fig. 7).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 and then given the well-established teaching of Yoneda '337, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 as taught by Yoneda '337 to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a file in a pre-determined format to the multi-media printer, since Yoneda '337 stated in col. 1, lines 7-13 that such a modification would ensure a method of controlling communication between a plurality of devices such as personal computers or printers connected to a network, and, in particular, relates to a method of communication control in a network wherein communication is possible under a plurality of protocols.

10. Claims 22, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. (US 5,467,434) in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147), and further in view of Lee (US 2003/0226139).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Lee '139. In particular, Lee '139 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client (i.e., the client computer then signals the network printer cause installation of the software update on the network printer; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 and then given the well-established teaching of Lee '139, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 as taught by Lee '139 to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client, since Lee '139 stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure a printer controller (or printer), which function is to control all printing functions on a related peripheral output device, will sometimes require files to be loaded from external distribution means for the purpose of providing software upgrades, new software installations, and/or batch configurations.

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 does not disclose the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by one of transmitting a command from a print client.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Lee '139. In particular, Lee '139 teaches the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by transmitting a command from a print client (i.e., the client computer then signals the network printer cause installation of the software update on the network printer; see Abstract).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 and then given the well-established teaching of Lee '139, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

modify the combination system of Hower, Jr. '434 and Reilly '147 as taught by Lee '139 to include: the multi-media printer, wherein the mapping module is updated by one of transmitting a command from a print client, since Lee '139 stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure a printer controller (or printer), which function is to control all printing functions on a related peripheral output device, will sometimes require files to be loaded from external distribution means for the purpose of providing software upgrades, new software installations, and/or batch configurations.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tuck et al. (US 2004/0249975) discloses computer networks.

Leone, III et al. (US 2004/0100651) discloses printing to a client site from an application running on a remote server.

DeHority (US 5,129,639) discloses printer configuration control system.

Herr (US 6,839,149) discloses preparation of production data for a print job using a still image proxy of a page description language image file.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571)-272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KING Y. POON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AN

10/26/2007